## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1 and 5 are held in the Office Action to be rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 2 of U.S. Patent No. 6,723,339 B2. In response, Applicants submit a Terminal Disclaimer over U.S. Patent No. 6,723,339 B2. Therefore, it is believed that this grounds for rejection has been rendered moot.

It is further held in the Office Action that Claims 1-11 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,475,519 B1. In response, Applicants submit a Terminal Disclaimer over U.S. Patent No. 6,475,519 B1. Therefore, it is believed that this grounds for rejection has been rendered moot.

It is submitted the Applicants specification and claims are in proper form. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of the claims under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting be withdrawn and the pending Claims 1-11 be passed to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas R. Savitsky

Reg. No. 31,661

Attorney for Applicants

Novartis Corporate Intellectual Property One Health Plaza, Building 104 East Hanover, NJ 07936-1080 (862) 778-7909

Date: February 4, 2005